Abstract: Hittite āppai- 'to go back; be finished, belongs to the class of ħi-verbs in stem-final -i- and is related to ĕppa 'back; after'. Derivation of ħi-verbs from adverbs in Hittite is confirmed by parā < parā 'forth, out' and šanna < šanna- 'to conceal' < *sanna- 'isolated, secret'. The contrasting i-stem inflection of āppai- shows that it is derived not from attested ĕppa, but from a pre-Hittite *opi cognate with attested HLuvian /a:ppi/.

Jasanoff (2003: 91ff.) derives Hittite ħi-verbs with stems in -i- from a PIE class of i-present with either *ē/zero or *ē/é ablaut, formed exclusively to roots of the shape *C(C)eH-. For alternate accounts see among others Oettinger (2001: 80-83) and Hajnal (to appear). Whether or not Jasanoff’s analysis is correct for PIE, his claim (2003: 116“) that Hittite āppai- 'be finished' is of unknown etymology and doubtfully a member of the ħi-verbs in -i- is not remotely credible. The inflection of the verb (understandably limited to the third person) is indisputably the same as that of dāi/tianzi 'put' and other ħi-verbs in -i-. There is also no doubt that it is derived from the adverb ĕppa in the sense 'after, (temporally) behind' (thus 'over and done with'), as seen by Sturtevant (1932: 2-3 et alibi), Kronasser (1966: 574), Tischler (1983: 43) and Puhvel (1984: 95). For an explicit account of the semantics see most recently Hoffner (2002: 169).

The verb is also probably attested as a motion verb meaning 'to go back, back up' in KBo 25.31 ii 12’ and KBo 20.26+25.34 Ro 22’. The first passage reads: mān=ašta NIN.DINGIR-as LUGAL-i ḫandāētta […]āppianzi ta AŠAR=ŠUNU āppanzi ‘When the N.D-priestess draws even with the king, the [ ] go back and take their places.’1 While a sense 'be finished with' is certainly possible with a person as subject, the immediate context here makes this meaning very unlikely. It would be very odd to say that someone is finished with an activity just when some other person draws even with someone else. The description is of the movements of various functionaries, not of ritual activities performed.

Nevertheless, Jasanoff’s skepticism regarding āppai- < ĕppa is justified in that none of the previous accounts of their formal relationship are persuasive. Sturtevant (1932: 2-3) suggests a univerbation of ĕppa and the perfect of *h₈ei- ‘go’, but all attested such univerbations in Anatolian are mi-verbs or medio-passives. One may compare Hittite paizzi/uezzi ‘goes/comes’, Luvian awīti ‘comes’ and Palaic āntienta ‘they go in’ (for the last see Melchert 1994: 198). Kronasser (1966: 574) and Puhvel (1984: 95) suggest a derivation comparable to that of Greek ἀπρίζω, to make ready’ < ĕprii ‘just now’ or Hittite ḫandāi- ‘to arrange’ < ḫanta ‘according to’, but both comparanda employ a

---

1 The missing subject is likely to be the ḫapiya-men mentioned in line ii 9. For the sense 'be lined up, draw even with' for medio-passive ḫandā-i- see Güterbock and van den Hout 1991: 17. The context of the second passage is the same. When some person draws even with someone else, the staff-bearer goes back and takes his place.
productive derivational suffix, and the example of *handāi- predicts present 3rd singular *āppāi zoning, again a mi-verb. 2

Crucial previously overlooked evidence that illuminates the derivation of āppai- is available in the form of the Hittite ḫi-verb p(a)rā-, to appear, come/go forth: < p(a)rā , forth, out. 3 The previously assumed stem p(a)rāi- is based on a false analogy with āppai- (thus Oettinger 1979: 472, Melchert 1994: 222, Güterbock & Hoffner 1995: 134, et al.). The stem p(a)rā- is proven by the verbal noun parannaš (see Güterbock & Hoffner, loc. cit.). 3 The contrast with šiyannaš to saī- , to seal, p(i)yanna to pai- , to give, and so forth is diagnostic: to a stem parai- the verbal noun could only be *pari(y)annaš.

Both the inflection of parā- as a ḫi-verb and the stem in -a- are confirmed by a likely cognate in HLuvian: ARHA para- , go missing, be missing, lack: < ,dis-appear (Melchert 1989: 360; cf. Hawkins 2000: 542). 4 The consistent spelling of the stem as par-ra/i-ra-a- (e.g. pres. 1st sg. pa-ra/i-ra+a-wa/i) strongly supports reading the stem as /pra(:)-/i, not /pr(a)i-/: see Melchert 1988: 29-31. 5 The parallel of p(a)rā- , appear, come/go forth: < p(a)rā supports the formation of āppai- as a ḫi-verb from the adverb āppa, but it leaves the stem in -i- unexplained. The answer is that āppai- is not formed from the attested āppa, but from an *āppi < *ōpi, preserved in HLuvian a-pi , afterward, further, again (for which see Oshiro 1988). For Hittite āppa as cognate with Greek ὦτη see already the arguments of Cowgill (1970: 116), Morpurgo Davies (1983) and others against Hamp (1981: 42&46—but cf. 43&47!) and Dunkel (1982/83). Attested Hittite and CLuvian āppa has been trivially remade after its functional opposite p(a)rā < *prō, which is old. If āppa reflected inherited *ōpo (Dunkel 1982/83: 84), the Hittite verb stem could only be *āppa-, like parā-.

A third example of a Hittite ḫi-verb formed from an adverb is šanna- , to conceal (thus also independently by Puhvel 2002: 675). Oettinger (1979: 159) posits a nasal-infix stem to a verbal root *senh-, but all other Indo-European evidence points to an adverbal base *sŋ(H)- (thus with Dunkel forthcoming): Greek ἀενό ,without', Lat. sine ,without', Skt. sanutār ,far removed', sāmatyā- ,distant, hidden', and so forth. 6 For the adverbal status of *šanna- in Hittite note especially the adverb šannapi , in an isolated place', attested in

2 The derivation of handāi- < ḫanta is in any case false. See the far superior account by Puhvel (1991: 106-107), who persuasively derives ḫandāi- from ḫānt-, the participle of ḫāt, trust, believe.

3 The form parannaš, which is thus far hapax, appears in HKM 26:7-10: nu Maver KUŠ; GUŠKIN kuit parannaš wahanannaš [LÜ-aš? ēša] EGIR-an=ma=an=kan Maver KUŠ ku[enta] n=at АŠME ,That the Gold Chariot Warrior [was a man]one of going forth and turning (back), but that afterwards the enemy killed him, I have heard it.' Whether one restores [LÜ-aš] in the first break with the editors of the CHD makes no difference in the interpretation. I find of going forth an obvious pendant for of turning (back)'. Whether the reference is positive, referring to skill in making deceptive maneuvers, or negative, implying cowardice, is not clear to me.

4 For the force of the preverb as ,dis-', reversing the sense of the verb, one may compare Hittite arha tarranu- ,to weaken, unman' and arha ḫapai- ,to dry' (lit. un-moisten'); see Oettinger 2003: 310-311.

5 Contra Oettinger (1986: 48) and Melchert (1994: 222) Palaic p(a)rāi- ,to appear' with pret. 3rd sg. p(a)rāt may be a genuine univerbation of parā with *hēi- (and thus a mi-verb!).

6 But for an alternate account of āevo see Fritz 1995.
iterated form as šannapi šannapi , scattered here and there', with the ending *-bhi of kuwapî , 'where; when' (see Güterbock, Hoffner and van den Hout 2002: 159, following Eichner 1992: 45-46, and Puhvel 2002: 675).

Pre-Hittite *ṣn(H)o * , isolated/separated off for oneself versus *ṣn(H)i in Latin sine and OIr. sain may be old or reflect a reshaping like that of āppa after *pró and *éndo. Hittite šanna- is phonologically compatible with either *ṣnh₁- (Schrijver 1991: 218) or a Lindeman variant *ṣnh(n)- (Pinault 1989: 42-43), but not with *ṣnh₂- (Oettinger 1979: 159 and Eichner 1992: 46).

As explicated in detail by Puhvel (2004), Hittite šanna- means 'to conceal, secret' primarily in the sense of 'to keep to oneself, withhold (verbal) information about', as opposed to munnâ(i)- 'to (actively) put out of sight'. It is therefore based on the use of the base *šanna < *ṣn(H)o * , isolated in the particular meaning 'separated for/kept to oneself, secret'.

We thus have at least three solid examples of Hittite hi-verbs formed from local adverbs. However, the formation of āppai-, p(a)rā- and šanna- is not derivation in the proper sense, but reflects the secondary inflection of adverbs. That is, the pre-Hittite forms of the hi-conjugation verbal endings have been directly added to the invariant adverbs: in the present third person *āppi+i/ *āppi+anti, *p(a)rā+i/*p(a)rā+anti, *šanna+i/šanna+anti. In the first, the attested present 3rd singular āppāi has been remodeled after the pattern of piddāi/pittianzi , 'flee' and other disyllabic hi-verbs in -i-.

The choice of the largely recessive hi-conjugation for such secondarily created verbs may seem surprising. Note, however, that it is likely that in pre-Luvo-Hittite there were no mi-verbs with present third singulars in *-iti or *-ati (or *-oti, depending on the precise date of the creation). On the other hand there could have been some hi-verbs with present third singulars already in -i < *-ei (cf. attested Hittite wāši , 'buys').

The precise mechanism of the formation of these verbs is probably unrecoverable. For āppai- one can imagine a 'delocutory' formation. That is, the adverb *opi was used alone as an imperative , 'Back!' in the sense , 'Get back!', and from this was backformed a fully inflected verb. But I cite this merely as one possibility. For the unpredictability of the transitivity of such formations from adverbs one may compare English intransitive , 'to back' (to move backward), attested from the 15th century, versus transitive , 'to back'

---

7 The sense 'empty' of the derived adjective šannapili- can be derived via an intervening 'deprived of'. Compare the two senses of French privé , isolated/separated off for oneself and 'deprived of'.

8 This notion of 'separated for oneself, secret' is also attested in Hittite in the Prayer of Kantuzzili (KUB 30.10 obv. 16): NINDA-an=za wemiyanun n=an=za AḪĪTI=YA natta kuwapiikki edun , 'If ever I found bread, I never ate it secretly by myself'. We do not know what Hittite stood behind the Akkadian AḪĪTI=YA , 'of my side'. The adverb šannapi or other derivative of *šanna cannot be excluded.

9 Attested mi-verbs with third singulars in -izi/-azzi (in Luvian -itti/-atti) would have still had *yeti and *eti at the prehistoric stage.
(to support from the back), attested from the 16th.\textsuperscript{10} Whatever the individual details, the mutually supporting examples of āppai-, p(a)rā- and šanna- argue that all three reflect the secondary inflection of local adverbs as ḫi-verbs.
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\textsuperscript{10} Indicative of the difficulty in recovering the precise avenue of such formations is the recent English neologism ’to out’, a transitive verb meaning ’to reveal that a person is gay’, explainable only via the previously existing expression ’to come out’, itself in turn by ellipsis from ’to come out of the „closet”‘, a recently formed idiom that requires further sociolinguistic information for its explication.
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